

3.5 INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS

Shirlee Herrington

101

From: John Baker <sharkbaker@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 03, 2015 3:37 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Martis Valley West & Campground Project

To the Placer County Board of Supervisors.

I am a resident of Agate Bay on the Northshore and am appalled that out of State Developers are allowed to rape and pillage our pristine Tahoe Forest and Ridge line for the benefit of their shareholder. The developers only want to line their pockets with profits at the expense of the Tahoe Environment. If they want to develop something, develop it in their only state not ours.

101-1

What took God millions of years to beautify, it takes man less then 5 years to ruin it. The last thing we need is more development at the expense of full time residents of the Tahoe basin. Look at the California side now, you can't even see the shoreline due to too many over built homes that our seasonal only. And to require enlarging highway #267 in to 4 lanes, can you image the huge traffic jams caused by both projects? If you want to experience this, just try and drive in the Bay area during peak hours.

101-2

In addition to the total destruction of ancient trees which we can not afford to lose, the sprawling complex of the West Project and Campground would be an absolute disgrace which I certainly would not want to have my name associated with it. As I told the Board of Governors of TRPA, if they approve this project, their name should be changed to "**Totally Rape of Pristine Areas.**"

101-3

If there are so many flaws in the DEIR Report, why are you even considering it? You have heard the old proverb, "if you open up the gates, you'll have a flood." Yes what is their next area to destroy?

I am asking you to absolutely and overwhelmingly vote NO on the Martis Valley West Project & Campground.

Thank you in advance for listening to your constituents

John Baker

PO Box 1075

Camelion Bay Ca 96140.

I01	John Baker December 3, 2015
------------	--

I01-1	The comment expresses opposition to the project, but does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR. The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter's opinions regarding the merits or qualities of the proposed MVWPSP into consideration when making decisions regarding the project.
I01-2	The comment expresses concerns related to widening SR 267 to four lanes, and general traffic congestion. Traffic impacts expected from implementation of the proposed project are described in Draft EIR Chapter 10, "Transportation and Circulation." Cumulative conditions are described beginning on page 10-37. Future expansion of SR 267 to four lanes is not proposed as part of the project. It is discussed as a potential improvement under Mitigation Measure 10-2 and Mitigation Measure 10-8f to address project-specific and cumulative traffic congestion, respectively, at several roadway segments. However, as discussed on page 10-32 of the Draft EIR, it is unlikely that this roadway improvement would be constructed before the project is implemented. Therefore, it is not expected that both projects would be constructed at the same time.
I01-3	<p>The comment expresses concern related to destruction of ancient trees. Tree removal is disclosed and evaluated in Chapter 5, "Land Use and Forest Resources." Specifically, see Impact 5-5.</p> <p>The comment implies that the project should not be approved by TRPA or Placer County. See response to comment I018-7, which explains that no portion of the West Parcel is located in the Lake Tahoe Basin, and no action by TRPA is required to implement the Specific Plan. The comment is likely also referring to the Brockway Campground Project, a proposal for which environmental review has not yet commenced, and which will be within the jurisdiction and decision-making authority of both TRPA and Placer County. Please see Master Response 2 regarding the Brockway proposal. The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter's opinions regarding the merits or qualities of the proposed MVWPSP into consideration when making decisions regarding the project.</p>

Shirlee Herrington

102

From: Anthony Basile <ajbunr@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 03, 2015 6:28 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Re: Martis Valley West Project Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Placer County Board of Supervisors,

I politely ask that you DENY approval for ANY AND ALL parts of the Martis Valley West project (hereafter referred to as MVW). If any portion of MVW is approved you will have opened the floodgates for development that will likely result in ridge line destruction around the Tahoe basin. I've lived here in North Lake Tahoe my entire life and I am sorry to say that more excessive developments like MVW are likely to come at a great cost to the year-round residents.

I believe that this will be Tahoe's likely eventual destiny unless people like you have the courage to save it before it's too late. Unless people like you see that you are the last line of defense for this beautiful as-of-yet undeveloped area, I foresee a day when almost the entire rim of the Lake Tahoe basin is scarred with development upon development like MVW. If you approve MVW, any developable ridge lines will be compromised and will most likely end up filled with mostly empty second homes that light up our beautiful night sky and hide our excellent view of the night stars.

102-1

SAVE TAHOE'S RIDGE LINES: DO NOT APPROVE MARTIS VALLEY WEST!!!

Sincerely,
Anthony Basile

I02

Anthony Basile
December 3, 2015

I02-1

The comment expresses opposition to the project and expresses concerns about development of the ridge lines and adverse effects on night skies. Project-related impacts to scenic vistas and light and glare were evaluated and determined to be less than significant, as described in Draft EIR Impact 9-1, "Adverse effects on scenic vistas," and Impact 9-4, "New sources of light and glare." The project would, however, contribute to cumulative significant and unavoidable light and glare impacts, as discussed in Cumulative Impact 9-9. The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter's opinions regarding the project and ridgeline protections into consideration.

Shirlee Herrington

103

From: Renae <renaebent66@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2015 1:26 PM
To: Maywan Krach; Placer County Environmental Coordination Services; tavance@trpa.org; trpa@trpa.org
Subject: Martis Valley West Projects

To Whom It May Concern,

In the 38 years that I have been a full-time resident of North Lake Tahoe, I have never heard of a more misguided, inappropriate and ill-conceived project as the proposed ridge top campground off Hwy 267. The fact that it is considered causes me to shake my head in wonder. The negative, even disastrous, consequences of this project are well documented and too numerous to mention with one exception. The impact on the currently congested Hwy 28 would result in complete gridlock not to mention the catastrophic results of an attempted evacuation during a forest fire.

103-1

That being said, a minor, yet important to me, consequence that has not been brought to light is the elimination of my favorite North Star Nordic trails that so many of us enjoy. Between the 760 home subdivision with commercial and the 550 campsite campground, much of the trail system would be eliminated.

103-2

But to return to the bigger picture, I'm sure the developer, in light of the widespread outrage, will respond by a downsized version of these adjoining projects. The point is that neither one, no matter how small, should be considered a campground on an unspoiled ridge looking down on an already over developed Lake Tahoe knowing all the associated consequences? You can't be serious!

103-3

Thanks in advance for considering my concerns,
Scott Bent

I03**Scott Bent**
November 11, 2015

- I03-1 The comment expresses general opposition to the “proposed ridge top campground off Hwy 267” project. Specifically, the comment expresses concern with congestion on nearby roadways. It should be noted that the proposed MVWPSP does not include a campground. The comment is referring to the Brockway Campground Project, a proposal for which environmental review has not yet commenced, and which will be within the jurisdiction and decision-making authority of both TRPA and Placer County. Please see Master Response 2 regarding the Brockway proposal. In addition, potential impacts to roadways from the proposed project are discussed in Draft Chapter 10, “Transportation and Circulation,” cumulative impacts are discussed starting on page 10-37.
- I03-2 The comment expresses concern about the elimination of trails and a trail system. Impacts on existing recreation facilities are addressed in Draft EIR Impact 17-1, “Impacts on existing recreation facilities.” As noted on page 17-1 of the Draft EIR, because the East and West Parcels are private property, all current recreation activity is informal/unauthorized, and occurs on user-made trails, except for cross-country skiing, biking and hiking on approximately 16 miles of West Parcel trails under a lease with CNL (CNL Lifestyle Properties, Inc.)/Vail Resorts for private use. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not eliminate existing public use trails. In addition, approximately 14 miles of trails are proposed within the West Parcel, which would connect to existing and planned trails including the future Martis Valley Trail, the Tompkins Memorial Trail, and the Tahoe Rim Trail, providing access for residents and guests to the broader regional trails network. The trails would support both winter sports, such as cross-country skiing and snowshoeing, and summer sports, such as hiking and biking. The Northstar Community Services District (NCS D) would be consulted regarding the location of internal trails and the most advantageous connections to trails outside of the MVWPSP (see Draft EIR Impact 10-4). Please note that although the comment refers to a 760 homes with commercial uses and a 550-site campground, the campground is not proposed as part of the MVWPSP. The Brockway Campground Project is a separate proposal for which environmental review has not yet commenced, and which will be within the jurisdiction and decision-making authority of both TRPA and Placer County. Please see Master Response 2 regarding the Brockway proposal.
- I03-3 The comment expresses general opposition to the project. The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter’s opinions regarding the merits or qualities of the proposed MVWPSP into consideration when making decisions regarding the project.

Shirlee Herrington

104

From: David Briscoe <tahoehiker@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, November 30, 2015 8:09 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Martis Valley West Project and Future Development

Please enter our opposition into the Public Record regarding the Martis Valley West Project, and all future development within and surrounding the Tahoe Basin.

We strongly oppose this proposed development, and any future development which will result in increased traffic, pollution, and public safety problems in and around the Tahoe Basin.

We feel that additional development results in too many negative impacts to traffic, pollution, and public safety to justify approving them

The Kings Beach Core Improvement Project is an example, Tonopalo is another. The continued approval of multi story projects without mitigating traffic congestion and pollution and safety problems needs to stop!

Thank you,

David and Lynne Briscoe
592 Iariat Circle
Incline Village, NV 89450
775-832-2282

104-1

I04

David and Lynne Briscoe
November 30, 2015

I04-1

The comment expresses opposition to the project and cites general concerns pertaining to impacts on traffic, pollution, and public safety. Potential effects from implementation of the proposed project related to traffic are addressed in Chapter 10, "Transportation and Circulation;" potential effects related to air and water pollution are addressed in Chapters 11, "Air Quality," and 15, "Hydrology and Water Quality," respectively; and potential effects related to public safety are addressed in Chapters 17, "Public Services and Recreation" and 18, "Hazards and Hazardous Materials," respectively. The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter's opinions regarding the merits or qualities of the proposed MVWPSP into consideration when making decisions regarding the project.

Shirlee Herrington

105

From: David Conmy <dconmy29@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 22, 2015 10:21 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Martis Valley West Parcel Project

I am a homeowner at 5101 North Lake Boulevard in Carnelian Bay and I am writing to express my opposition to the Martis Valley West Parcel Project proposal. I have stated my opposition in the past due to environmental and traffic concerns and continue to urge that the proposal be rejected. The Tahoe area is a pristine area that is already being affected by too many people and too much traffic.

105-1

Regards,

David Conmy
5101 N. Lake Boulevard #21
Carnelian Bay, CA

I05

David Conmy
November 22, 2015

I05-1

The comment expresses opposition to the project. The comment references general environmental and traffic concerns but does not identify specific impacts or analyses from the Draft EIR. Potential effects from implementation of the proposed project related to traffic are addressed in Chapter 10, "Transportation and Circulation." The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter's opinions regarding the merits or qualities of the proposed MVWPSP into consideration when making decisions regarding the project.

106

COMMENTS ON MARTIS VALLEY WEST DEIR

Joy Dahlgren 12/21/15

TRANSPORTATION SECTION COMMENTS

10.1.1 Existing Study Area

The study area is limited to SR 267 between I-80 on the north and SR 28 on the south. This is far too limited, because it ignores the effects of additional travel generated by the MVWP project on the two highways it connects and the areas through which they pass. Many project-generated trips would affect these roads. According to the DEIR, in the summer 35% of trips either begin or end on I-80 and another 35% begin or end on SR 28. In the winter 39% begin or end on I-80 and 30% on SR 28. The EIR should, but does not, say what proportion are between I-80 and SR 28 without a stop on SR 267.

I06-1

The effects of trips generated by the MVWP on both I-80 and SR 28 should be analyzed because both become congested on peak weekends. And the more congested they are, the more delay is caused by each additional vehicle added to the congestion. Each car traveling to or from the project that enters such a congested area will delay all following cars. This can result in significant delay given the high traffic volumes on I-80—Caltrans estimated an annual daily average of 34,500 vehicles per day in 2014 east of the intersection with State Route 89 in Truckee. The delay is not just an inconvenience to travelers; it increases fuel consumption and thus global warming as well as emissions of pollutants that reduce air quality region-wide.

I06-2

Therefore, the effects of the project on traffic and vehicle emissions on I-80 and Kings Beach and elsewhere on Lake Tahoe should be considered.

10.1.2 Study Periods and 10.1.3 Traffic Data Collection

The DEIR methodology for obtaining winter peak traffic movements appears problematic. The DEIR did traffic counts on Sunday, March 9, 2014 and then applied a factor to approximate the 30th highest winter peak hour volume, which it claims to be the standard for transportation facility design. The problems are that the DEIR is not related to *facility design*, but to the *impacts of increased facility use*. Furthermore, the 30th highest peak hour might make sense when the peak hour is likely to be a weekday, but not when it is a weekend day, because there are only 8-10 weekend days per month. The DEIR provides no detail on when the 30th highest peak hour occurred.

I06-3

The use of a factor (based on Caltrans data) to estimate traffic movements also poses problems. Because the movements in each direction at an intersection are often dependent on movements in other directions even when the intersection is signalized, it is not clear that

I06-4

applying a factor to observed movements would result in actual peak period movements. The DEIR does not provide enough detail regarding how the factor was derived or how it was applied.

I06-4
cont.

Actual measurements on a Sunday in January or February should be used.

10.3.2 Methods and Assumptions

The DEIR methodology for estimating trips resulting from the project makes little sense. It assumes that 80% of the Single Family Homes and Town Homes are second homes and then applies a different and inappropriate trip generation rate to all of them. But the number of trips generated depends not on the proportion that are second homes but on the proportion that are occupied during peak periods.

The DEIR classifies second homes as Recreational Homes, a classification that assumes that much of their activity takes place within the recreational homes community. But the second homes are located in the same community as the full-time residences. When occupied, their travel (trip generation rates) should be the same as full-time residences.

I06-5

To be more accurate, the trip generation rate for the particular type of residence, multiplied by the number of that type residence occupied during the peak period should be used.

The EIR should name the information sources and method used to assign the projected trips to the various origins and destinations. The DEIR contains no data on origin and destination pairs, so it is impossible to confirm that the traffic movements match the number of peak trips estimated.

10.3.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts on Intersection Operations

According to the DEIR even if there were no other development in the area, the project would result in "Significant" impacts on intersections in the area. (Table 10-12).

I06-6

The I-80 westbound ramps would degrade from LOS E to LOS F in the winter peak. The intersection of SR 267 with Schaffer Mill Road and the Truckee Airport Road would also degrade from LOS E to LOS F. Traffic on Highlands View Road would degrade from LOS E to LOS F.

The DEIR says that delay on Highlands View Road can be reduced to "less than significant" levels by directing traffic to Northstar Drive, which has a traffic light and less delay.

The DEIR suggests that delay at the other two intersections could be reduced by optimizing signal timing, but gives no evidence that this would be possible, implying that it could be if Caltrans were willing. But why wouldn't Caltrans be willing if it were possible? The DEIR rates these impacts "significant and unavoidable".

I06-6
cont.

Impacts on Roadway Segments

All 5 of the roadway segments not in the town of Truckee would be degraded to LOS E, from current LOS E or D in both summer and winter peaks. Although the project would pay over \$3 million in impact fees, this is nowhere near the cost of widening SR 267 or improving the intersections. Thus, these impacts are "significant and unavoidable".

I06-7

10.3.5 Cumulative Conditions--Impacts

The effects of the project are much greater when other development that is either already approved or is likely, is taken into account: delays of over 3 minutes during winter and summer peaks at the intersections of SR 267 and Brockway Road and Schaffer Mill Road, delays of over 2 minutes at the I-80 ramps in the winter peak, delays of about a minute at the project access road in winter and summer, and most road segments operating at LOS F in both summer and winter peaks.

I06-8

Mitigation Measures

The DEIR says that the following improvements would reduce traffic impacts to less-than-significant levels (pages 10-41,42). Each is followed by an estimated cost and year of completion from Caltrans Transportation Corridor Concept Report, State Route 267 (2012).

1. Construction of a two-lane roundabout at the SR 267/I-80 westbound ramp intersection
\$3,500,000 – 2030
2. Construction of a two-lane roundabout at the SR 267/I-80 eastbound ramp intersection
\$3,100,000 – 2030
3. Construction of a two-lane roundabout or equivalent improvement at the Brockway Road/Soaring Road intersection with SR 267
4. Construction of a two-lane roundabout or widening of SR 267 at its intersection with Schaffer Mill Road and Truckee Airport Road
5. Widening SR 267 to 4 lanes between the county line and Brockway summit \$10,000,000 – 2035 (The DEIR shows a Placer County estimated cost of \$32,433,700 --pg 31)

I06-9

The project would pay a traffic impact fee of \$3,685,511 to Placer County. Obviously, paying a fee for roadway improvements mitigates nothing unless the fees and other funding sources are sufficient to fully fund the improvements. And the completion dates of the planned projects are far in the future.

I06-9
cont.

A Mitigation Measures not Considered in the DEIR

Both intersection and road segment delay could be reduced during peak travel hours in the winter by reducing peak ski traffic to and from Northstar from the north. Although Northstar already provides bus service between resorts and the ski area, and TART provides bus service, automobile travel might be further reduced by establishing remote parking lots in Truckee and the north shore of Tahoe with frequent bus shuttles to and from the ski area during the peak.

I06-10

GENERAL COMMENTS

The Scope of the DEIR is Too Limited Geographically

The DEIR finds that the relatively small amount of travel generated by the MVWP development would cause significant delays to all travelers on SR 267. It is the nature of delay that as a facility becomes more crowded, each additional trip has a larger effect than the previous trip on delay because more travelers are affected and the number of cars that must travel through the bottleneck increases, thus taking each car longer to get through. The effects of the MVWP project on traffic will also be experienced elsewhere in Placer County, on I-80 and in the Tahoe basin.

I06-11

Relationship of Martis Valley to Lake Tahoe

The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency has a policy of discouraging housing in sensitive environmental zones and areas far from activity centers. The purpose is to preserve the Lake Tahoe environment by minimizing the effects of human activity on the environment. Although the Martis Valley West Parcel is not under TRPA's jurisdiction, it is much closer to Lake Tahoe than to Truckee. Thus any development there would have an effect on Lake Tahoe, especially in the summer when water activities at Lake Tahoe would attract MVWP residents and visitors.

I06-12

Therefore, if Placer County wants to preserve Lake Tahoe, it should pay attention to the area around it, even outside its watershed. Too much building, too much forest depletion, and too much traffic around the Tahoe basin could damage the environment that makes Lake Tahoe so attractive.

The DEIR's transportation section should analyze the effect of development of the Martis Valley West Parcel on Lake Tahoe's environment.

Relationship of the proposed Brockway Campground to MWVP

The proposed campground has the same owner as the MWVP. Why are two practically adjacent projects not included in the same EIR? The 550 site campground would be accessed via the Fibreboard Freeway which intersects SR 267 at the Brockway summit. Most traffic to and from the campground would likely move between it and Tahoe, but some traffic would move between it and Truckee. The effects of campground traffic on peak summer travel times should be assessed along with the effects of MWVP traffic.

I06-13

Project Alternatives

The DEIR states clearly that the No-Project Alternative is the *environmentally superior alternative*. Among the other alternatives, Alternative 3 is environmentally superior. It would generate far fewer trips—43% fewer daily trips. Without providing any traffic analysis of this alternative, the DEIR claims that its transportation impacts would be significant and unavoidable. This is hard to believe. A traffic analysis supporting this contention should be presented in the EIR.

I06-14

Alternatives 2 and 4 would increase transportation impacts.

Another alternative that should be considered in the EIR is constructing the proposed Brockway campground on the MVWP instead. The 550 campsites would have less impact than 760 housing units, and, if fully utilized, would serve more visitors than would the currently planned MVWP project, which assumes 140 full time residences and only 520 residences for visitors.

I06-15

SHOULD A PROJECT WITH SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE NEGATIVE IMPACTS BE APPROVED?

The more relevant question is “should a project be approved if the benefits of the project are less than its costs?” A proxy for the *benefits* is what people are willing to pay for the components of the development. There is no simple proxy for the *costs*, and they are generally not thought of in monetary terms. What is the value of one minute of delay? Maybe not much until it is added to another minute of delay and another and another. Lost is not only the time, but the feeling of freedom that people associate with mountain open space. One is not escaping urban pressures, but finding new pressures where one goes to get away. What are the costs of the diminished air quality, reducing wild life habitat, increased global warming, and increased erosion?

I06-16

Turning the question around, should the environment and access and movement in the Martis Valley and its surrounding area be degraded in order to provide 760 additional dwelling units in the area? Especially, if 80% will be second homes?

IO6-16
cont.

I think not. Maintaining and growing the forest makes sense from a carbon sequestration point of view. It also makes sense from a long term economic and recreational point of view.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Joy Dahlgren
1200 Idylberry Road 429 Gonowabie Road
San Rafael, CA 94903 Crystal Bay, NV 89409
(415) 464 7930

Credentials

I have 25 years of experience in transportation, as an analyst for a consulting firm specializing in freight operations, as a planner for the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District, and as a research engineer with the Institute of Transportation Studies at the University of California, Berkeley.

I have an AB in Statistics, an MPP in Public Policy, and a PhD in Civil Engineering, all from the University of California at Berkeley.

My family and I have owned property in Crystal Bay at Lake Tahoe since 1950, and I have visited the area regularly ever since then.

I06

Joy Dahlgren
December 21, 2015

I06-1

The comment states that the study area is limited and does not analyze the impacts on I-80 and SR 28 beyond SR 267. See response to comment I018-13 regarding the study area for the EIR transportation analysis.

As discussed in Sections 4.1 and 4.2.2 of the Draft EIR, the EIR analyzes and discloses potential impacts in varying geographic contexts, as appropriate for each technical issue. The geographic scope of project-related traffic impacts and associated cumulative impacts includes the broader Truckee-Tahoe region. Regarding recommendations for analysis of I-80, Caltrans, which owns and operates I-80 was consulted during the preparation of the environmental analyses. This included a meeting in February 2014 to solicit Caltrans input on analysis locations and methodologies. Caltrans staff identified the following facilities for analysis:

- ▲ SR 267/I-80 Westbound Ramps intersection
- ▲ SR 267/I-80 Eastbound Ramps intersection
- ▲ I-80 Eastbound Off-Ramp to SR 267 diverge segment
- ▲ I-80 Eastbound On-Ramp from SR 267 merge segment
- ▲ I-80 Westbound Off-Ramp to SR 267 diverge segment
- ▲ I-80 Westbound On-Ramp from SR 267 merge segment

In addition, Caltrans submitted comment letters on the Draft EIR (see Letters SA2 and SA3), neither of which mentioned the need for, nor requested, an analysis of the I-80 freeway segments beyond the merge and diverge areas of the on and off-ramps at SR 267.

Nonetheless, an evaluation of potential project impacts on I-80 is presented here in response to this comment. According to the Interstate 80 Transportation Corridor Concept Report (TCCR) (Caltrans 2010), the freeway mainline at SR 267 operated at LOS D and had an average annual daily traffic of 35,000 vehicles in 2007. The TCCR indicates that this segment of I-80 has a peak hour volume of 4,350 vehicles, which represents a 0.75 volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio. This implies a capacity of 5,800 vehicles per hour. The TCCR also specifies a future year 2028 peak hour volume forecast of 6,180 vehicles, which represents a 1.06 volume-to-capacity ratio (i.e. over capacity and LOS F).

Had a detailed analysis of I-80 been conducted, operations would presumably have been at an unacceptable level given that a peak winter weekend was being studied. Also, the TCCR already notes that under cumulative conditions, the freeway would operate unacceptably. Page 10-19 of the DEIR describes how a 0.05 increase in the V/C ratio was applied to judge the significance of impacts for segments of SR 267 under unacceptable conditions. Had I-80 been studied in the DEIR, this same criterion would have been applied.

The project would add trips to I-80 as shown in the following table (Table 3-5). The comment stated that the trips to/from the west were from Sacramento and the San Francisco Bay Area; however, only a portion of the trips are to/from those destinations. Some trips to/from the west of SR 267 on I-80 are simply local traffic to destinations within Truckee. Despite this fact, on the freeway mainline segments immediately adjacent to SR 267 (which includes the local traffic remaining within Truckee), the project would not cause a 0.05 V/C ratio increase. Hence, project impacts to I-80 would be less than significant.

Table 3-5 Project-Generated Traffic on I-80

Scenario	Project-Generated Traffic on I-80 West of SR 267			V/C Ratio Increase	Project-Generated Traffic on I-80 East of SR 267			V/C Ratio Increase
	EB	WB	Total		EB	WB	Total	
Summer Friday PM Peak Hour	37	37	74	0.01	20	20	40	0.01
Winter Sunday Peak Hour	40	44	84	0.01	25	23	48	0.01

Note: Source of project-added traffic is DEIR Exhibit 10-6.

V/C Ratio calculated based on free capacity from the *Interstate 80 Transportation Corridor Concept Report* (Caltrans 2010).

IO6-2

The comment questions the use of the 30th highest hour for analyzing impacts of increased facility use when analyzing a weekend day, and also states that the Draft EIR provides no detail on when the 30th highest hour occurred.

As noted in the Draft EIR, and consistent with other EIRs completed for projects in eastern Placer County, impacts on study roadways and intersections are determined by measuring the effects of project traffic on the summer weekday pm peak hour and the winter 30th highest hour. The winter peak is technically defined as the 30th-highest hour of travel demand during the ski season (Placer County 2003). The 30th highest hour used to represent the winter peak hour is appropriate for analysis of establishing a baseline for which project impacts are analyzed due to the hour generally corresponding to a busy (but not the busiest) weekend day during the ski season during the hour that ski areas are closing and skiers departing ski areas mix with local and inter-regional traffic. This was established by reviewing Caltrans hourly traffic count data on SR 267 for the entire 2012/2013 winter ski season (November 2012 through March 2013). Although the comment notes that there are only 8-10 weekend days per month, the hour used is the 30th highest hour out of all hours of every day throughout the winter season. This ended up corresponding with January 3rd, 2012, at 3 p.m.

The 30th highest hour is commonly used in both facility design and in traffic impact analysis for the purpose of identifying a peak period up to the level before unusually high outliers of traffic levels occur. Note that the analysis of the 30th highest hour is determined from all hours of every day throughout the winter season; therefore, it represents a level of traffic very close to the absolute maximum observed traffic volume. This is not to be mistaken for the 30th highest peak hour, in other words, taking the peak hour of every day and finding the 30th highest hour out of that group.

IO6-3

The comment questions the use of a factor to estimate traffic movements because it is not clear if the factor applies to peak period movements. The comment also states that there is not enough information regarding how the factor was derived.

Because the traffic count data do not exactly represent the traffic volumes for the study period (for the winter season – the 30th highest hour), a factor is necessary to adjust the collected traffic count volumes to be used for the analysis.

The traffic counts collected for the analysis were factored up to the volume of the 30th highest hour determined from Caltrans data. In addition, a growth factor was applied to convert the data used for the analysis from 2013 to 2014 based on historical traffic growth also established from Caltrans traffic count data. The resulting factor was applied to all turning movements at each of the study intersections.

Turning movement traffic volumes at the study intersections were collected on March 9th, 2014. These traffic volumes first needed to be assessed to determine if they represented the

appropriate study period for the winter peak (the 30th highest hour). Available data to make that assessment was obtained from Caltrans' permanent count station on SR 267 just south of Brockway Road/Soaring Way. Caltrans keeps a historical record of the number of vehicles passing through these count locations hourly over the course of many years; however, there are only a few key roadway count stations on SR 267. This does not directly provide the intersection turning movement volumes necessary for the traffic analysis. The Caltrans' data are able to indicate when the actual 30th highest hour occurred at their count station. The traffic volumes from the collected counts at the location of the Caltrans' count station were then compared to the 30th highest hour traffic volume from Caltrans data in order to determine what factor was necessary to adjust the traffic counts to represent the 30th highest hour. This factor was then applied to all turning movements equally; not all turning movements may require this level of adjustment, but it represents a conservative approach since the traffic count volumes needed to be factored up. In addition, the Caltrans data available at the initiation of the traffic study only covered the period through 2013. The traffic counts also needed to be factored up 1.6 percent per year (a growth rate also determined with historical Caltrans data) in order to reflect the traffic growth between 2013 and 2014.

- IO6-4 The comment takes issue with calculating trip generation, stating that trip generation does not depend on the proportion of second homes but on the proportion of second homes that are occupied during the peak hour. The comment further elaborates that the trip generation rate for occupied second homes should be the same as the full-time residences.
- See Master Response 5 regarding trip generation methodology. Single-family housing and second homes require different trip generation because the trip-making patterns are not exactly the same. One example is that full-time residential includes external trips to and from work, while second home residential is not expected to have this trip pattern.
- The comment also states that the Draft EIR contains no data on origin and destination pairs, and that the information sources and method for trip distribution should be included. The project trip distribution was determined using the Truckee TransCAD traffic model. Project land use was input into the model, and the project trips were tracked throughout the network. This was compared for consistency with the traffic patterns from existing traffic counts and with professional judgment considering the locations of nearby complimentary land uses.
- IO6-5 The comment describes the existing plus project level of service at SR 267/I-80 WB ramps and SR 267/Schaffer Mill Road, and questions why Caltrans would not be willing to optimize the signal as the mitigation in order to avoid the significant and unavoidable impact.
- As stated in the Draft EIR (page 10-28), Placer County cannot guarantee that Caltrans would optimize the signal timings. While signal retiming would be feasible for Caltrans, it could be dependent on other factors such as pedestrian and bike timing and the need for repairs or improvements required for advanced detection prior to any timing changes. Because Placer County does not have direct responsibility for implementation of these mitigation measures, it cannot make assurances that Caltrans would do in the future.
- IO6-6 The comment reiterates information from the Draft EIR regarding roadway segments and states that \$3 million is not enough to widen SR 267. This is consistent with the information provided in Table 10-14 of the Draft EIR on page 10-31.
- IO6-7 The comment states that the effect of the project would be much greater when other development that is either already approved, or is likely to be approved, is taken into account.

- The traffic study accounted for approved and reasonably foreseeable development projects in the cumulative traffic forecasting. These other development projects are incorporated in the traffic model used to develop cumulative forecasts, as noted in the Draft EIR (page 10-37).
- IO6-8 The comment lists estimated cost and year of completion for Mitigation Measure 10-8 and states that paying a fee for roadway improvements does not mitigate unless the fees and other funding sources are sufficient to fully fund the improvements. As noted in the discussion following Mitigation Measures 10-2, the project would pay its fair share of identified capital improvements identified in the CIP. However, because it is unlikely that the identified improvements would be constructed before the project is implemented, Impact 10-2 (Impacts to roadway segments) was determined to be significant and unavoidable. The Truckee TIF Program and Placer County CIP are implemented using other funding sources in addition to traffic impact fees, as indicated in Table 10-14. The comment notes that the completion dates of the planned projects are far in the future. The comment lists completion dates from 2030 to 2035. As described on page 3-33 in Chapter 3, "Project Description," of the Draft EIR, the project is anticipated to be built out over approximately 20 years, depending on factors such as market demand. Therefore, the full impacts of the proposed project would also be far in the future, similar to buildout of future roadway improvements.
- IO6-9 The comment suggests a mitigation measure not considered in the Draft EIR,—a reduction in peak ski traffic to/from Northstar by establishing remote parking lots in Truckee and the north shore of Tahoe with frequent bus shuttles or use of TART bus service.
- The suggested mitigation would address existing and future conditions related to peak ski traffic between Northstar and Truckee and Northstar and the north shore of Tahoe. This traffic is not an effect of the project, however, and the project would not be responsible for minimizing these effects. In considering mitigation measures to minimize significant effects, the State CEQA Guidelines state that mitigation measures must be "roughly proportional" to the impacts of the project (State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(a)(4)(B)). Please note that the project proposes to implement a shuttle with the 340th unit. The shuttle would travel to local destinations, including Northstar and potentially including destinations to the south of the project site within the Tahoe Basin.
- IO6-10 The comment states the effects of the project would be experienced elsewhere in Placer County, on I-80, and in the Tahoe Basin. See response to comment IO6-1.
- IO6-11 The comment suggests that the Draft EIR transportation section analyze the effect of development of the project on Lake Tahoe's environment. The Transportation and Circulation chapter of the Draft EIR includes applicable discussions of traffic impacts into the Tahoe Basin. For example, the LOS discussion in Impact 10-1 on pages 10-27 to 10-28 describes impacts in the Basin at the intersection of State Route (SR) 267 and SR 28. Impacts to roadway segments, including from the project access roadway to SR 28 in the Basin, are also addressed. Other environmental effects in and around the Tahoe Basin are discussed in the other resource chapters of the Draft EIR.
- IO6-12 The comment addresses the proposed Brockway Campground project. Please see Master Response 2 regarding the Brockway Campground project.
- IO6-13 The comment notes that a traffic analysis should be provided for the Alternative 3. The size of the Reduced Density Alternative (Alternative 3) was calculated by balancing results of a sensitivity analysis to determine how much the project would have to be reduced to decrease certain significant and unavoidable impacts (including intersection operations at the SR 267/Project Access Roadway intersection) with the feasibility of the alternatives. Considering that many of the study roadway segments and intersections would operate at an unacceptable level under Cumulative No Project, adding the reduced project alternative

would exacerbate these unacceptable conditions. With the reduced density alternative, the level of exacerbation would be less than the full proposed project; however, it would not reduce these roadway segments and intersections to a less-than-significant level. The reduced alternative is expected to worsen the already unacceptable intersections beyond the allowable level for a less-than-significant impact (by more than a four-second increase in delay), and the already unacceptable roadway segments beyond the allowable level (by increasing the V/C ratio by more than 0.05). Therefore, besides the intersection at SR 267/Project Access Roadway, generally the same intersections and roadway segments that were significant and unavoidable under the full proposed project would also be significant and unavoidable under the reduced density alternative.

- I06-14 The comment suggests an alternative that would construct the Brockway Campground on the project site. As noted in Master Response 2 regarding Brockway Campground, it is a separate proposal from the proposed MVWPSP. The Brockway Campground has separate objectives, and buildout of camp sites on the project site would not meet the objectives of the MVWPSP, as described on pages 3-6 and 3-7 of the Draft EIR.
- I06-15 The comment questions whether or not the project should be approved. The comment does not specifically address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR. The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter's opinions regarding the merits or qualities of the proposed MVWPSP into consideration when making decisions regarding the project.

107

To: Placer County Board of Supervisors

Re: Martis Valley West Project Draft Environmental Impact Report

As a property owner and life-long area recreationalist I am writing to urge you to DENY approval for the Martis Valley West Project for the following reasons:

Position: Unilaterally oppose all zoning changes which allow human development in forest resource lands zoned for forest product production and recreational uses.

The government of California and Placer County have historically (since World War II) have been required to limit sprawl and building in agricultural resource areas UNLESS THERE ARE NO OTHER CHOICES AVAILABLE TO SUIT A DIRE NEED. Now the county of Placer is being asked to go through several unusual zoning changes and permit challenges to allow a new development in an agricultural resource area zoned for forest product growth and forest recreation. This change is an extreme variance from California's normal and prevailing goals for land use in the Tahoe Basin and mountains just north of the basin. See California formation of the TRPA and court rulings therein. See also www.TRPA.org See LAFCO <http://www.calafco.org/about.htm> **See LAFCO mission statement below. **

107-1

Taking a large parcel of land obtained, held and economically developed as it was zoned: Timberland reserve allowing recreational use, and then arbitrarily just deciding that isn't what the owner wants anymore is not a sufficient reason to allow change. See: California Public Resources Code Section 4621.2 This code provides language for many reasons why there should be layers and layers of undeniable reasons to change before it is allowed.

The Sierra mountain range is the watershed that allows California to exist. The forests provide products of more than just wood, it provides wildlife habitat, hiking and skiing and other recreation and a reservoir for the groundwater in the higher elevations of both California and Nevada. Millions of people depend on the water filtered and held and slowly delivered to both states. Tahoe is more than a local forest with a lake; it is a nationally recognized treasure. It is mountains, creeks and watersheds, forests full of trees and wildlife and a mindset.

Therefore, based on goals set by the people of the state of California and by laws therein, I will speak to why some of the reasons that zoning changes should not be allowed. These reasons are based on economic values: the cost of real destruction to watershed, groundwater reserves, forest resources, loss of wildlife habitat, clean air, clean water, noise, traffic, night light pollution, increased fire danger VERSUS the economic gain for a large land holding company and a few trades persons who deal with home building and sales AND the county tax collector.

107-2

History and site constraints: Tahoe is also a mountain rimmed basin that holds whatever is brought into it and over the last 150 years it has continued to lose water clarity solely by the actions of humans. As for human impact: humans change, modify and "develop" the ecosystem with rapid detrimental repercussions to the area. Most notable changes are sediments and pollutants entering the waters from developments of roads and destruction of the forest by grading, compacting and impervious coverage.

As intelligent beings, should we consider what we are doing? Could we possibly tread a lighter footprint in this treasure of an area? For example: As a high altitude resort area, Tahoe already has more housing held in second home surplus than is needed or used with any regularity. The estimated population in

107-3

current housing is 60-75% second home ownership and vacation use. To that point, Tahoe already has many lodging choices for all persons to come and enjoy. There are still many vacant lots in already developed neighborhoods that could still be built into additional homes. Adding a new developed neighborhood geared only for the luxury market serves to point to greed of developers. It enhances the wasted opulence of seldom used homes in this area by a process including plowing up animal habitat and further forest destruction. On top of that, this development has been engineered to make a few people (the 1% ers) wealthier and exclude the rest of the population. An “exclusive gated community” in this case, it is designed to purposely exclude lower income people.

To that end, is it the moral obligation of the government (representing all the people) to serve only the interests of the wealthy? Just because a luxury home will garner higher taxes for the county, should the county kowtow to developers while we lose watershed, forest and wildlife habitat for a few people to inhabit a second home for a few weeks a year? What waste!

Do the terms “luxury”, or “gated community”, or “exclusive” all of a sudden make it ok to destroy a mountain side? Do the town of Truckee and the advocates trying to preserve Martis Valley have the right to negotiate a ransom exchange?

And if the need is there for housing, why not go to the locations and price range where the market serves more people. Ask the question: Does the county better serve the people by allowing more affordable housing in this area? We are the people who the county represents. We should be heard with no bias to the weight of our pocket books.

The costs to the environment will impact all. Every development includes these impacts and even though the Environmental Impact Reports may say “they can be dealt with”, they are real and they can’t be “mitigated” with money. They include:

- Compromised watershed and storm water absorption into groundwater reserves
- Compacted soils, run-off, polluted waters
- Loss of older trees
- Loss of migration trails, forage and animal habitat
- Noise
- Traffic
- Fire danger increased 10 times
- Water use
- Light pollution

The benefits to the area are few. They include:

- A few management and caretaking jobs
- Sales of homes including realtor fees and title/escrow companies
- Carpenters and maintenance jobs
- Extra checkers at grocery stores during high season
- Note: there is nothing for wildlife or forests

And all this provided by big companies that have shown in the past business practices as:

- Build only for exclusive use of wealthy

I07-3
cont.

I07-4

I07-5

I07-6

- Build using local contractors and then file bankruptcy
- Build excessive products that don't sell well and sit on market for years
- Build and impact area and then leave the mess to the locals to deal with
- Build with knowledge that they will not have to stay

In summary, I request that you unilaterally oppose all zoning changes which allow human development in forest resource lands zoned for forest product production and recreational uses.

For these noted and many other reasons, the petition for zoning change and allowance for development of forest resource lands should be denied. The applicants are asking for too much of a change and they are aware of the risks of spending money even asking. However it is government's responsibility to be sure that the benefit to a few should not be paid by the losses to many. Our local government should follow the goals and laws set by the State. Our county supervisors should see the wisdom to not allow this development into lands not already zoned for housing as it is wasteful, polluting and the need for more vacation housing is not present in the market.

Thank you, Susan Daniels/ North Tahoe Resident

I07-6
cont.

**** Goals set by California are partially set by the California Public Resource Code which is enforced by LAFCO and are attached here:**

OBJECTIVES

To Encourage the Orderly Formation of Local Governmental Agencies

LAFCOs review proposals for the formation of new local governmental agencies and for changes in the organization of existing agencies. There are 58 LAFCOs working with nearly 3,500 governmental agencies (400+ cities, and 3,000+ special districts). Agency boundaries are often unrelated to one another and sometimes overlap at random, often leading to higher service costs to the taxpayer and general confusion regarding service area boundaries. LAFCo decisions strive to balance the competing needs in California for efficient services, affordable housing, economic opportunity, and conservation of natural resources.

To Preserve Agricultural Land Resources

LAFCo must consider the effect that any proposal will produce on existing agricultural lands. By guiding development toward vacant urban land and away from agricultural preserves, LAFCo assists with the preservation of our valuable agricultural resources.

To Discourage Urban Sprawl

Urban sprawl can best be described as irregular and disorganized growth occurring without apparent design or plan. This pattern of development is characterized by the inefficient delivery of urban services (police, fire, water, and sanitation) and the unnecessary loss of agricultural resources and open space lands. By discouraging sprawl, LAFCo limits the misuse of land resources and promotes a more efficient system of local governmental agencies.

I07-7

I07	Susan Daniels No date
I07-1	<p>The comment expresses opposition to the project. The comment does not specifically address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR. The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter's opinions regarding the merits or qualities of the proposed MVWPSP into consideration when making decisions regarding the project.</p> <p>The comment states that Placer County is being asked to change zoning in an agricultural resource area. As explained in Section 1.2.1, "Effects Found Not to be Significant," of the Draft EIR, the MVWPSP would not be located on or adjacent to farmland or land associated with a Williamson Act contract; therefore, the project site is not considered an agricultural resource area.</p> <p>Alteration of existing land uses and consistency with the General Plan and MVCP are fully described and evaluated in Chapter 5, "Land Use and Forest Resources," of the Draft EIR. Specifically, Impact 5-3 addresses consistency of the proposed MVWPSP with the MVCP and the Placer County General Plan, and Impact 5-1 describes the proposed change in land use under the MVWPSP and describes the process in Placer County for adoption and implementation of a Specific Plan. The MVWPSP includes policies that maintain consistency between the MVWPSP and the MVCP and Placer County General Plan. As documented in Appendix D of the Draft EIR, the MVWPSP goals and policies are consistent with the MVCP and Placer County General Plan.</p>
I07-2	<p>The comment also generally opposes the project, citing concerns about various environmental resources resulting in associated economic costs. However, the comment does not specifically address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR. The issues raised in the comment are addressed in the Draft EIR (see, for example, Chapter 15 regarding water quality).</p>
I07-3	<p>The comment generally opposes the project, points to available housing in Lake Tahoe, and questions the need for additional vacation homes. The comments are focused on the merits of the project rather than the adequacy of the Draft EIR analyses. The objectives of the proposed MVWPSP are included in the Draft EIR, beginning on page 3-6.</p>
I07-4	<p>The comment raises concerns regarding the environmental impacts of the project. Please see the Draft EIR. The loss of trees is evaluated in Impact 5-4 and Cumulative Impact 5-8 in Chapter 5, "Land Use and Forest Resources." Biological resource impacts, such as habitat and migratory corridors, are addressed in Chapter 7, "Biological Resources." Water quality and hydrology concerns are evaluated in Chapter 15, "Hydrology and Water Quality." Water demand and supply is evaluated in Chapter 16, "Utilities," and traffic is evaluated in Chapter 10, "Transportation and Circulation." Visual impacts and light pollution are addressed in Chapter 9, "Visual Resources," and wildfire hazards are addressed in Chapter 18, "Hazards and Hazardous Materials." Please also see Master Response 9 in this Final EIR related to wildland fire, emergency evacuation, and the draft Emergency Preparedness and Evacuation Plan prepared as part of the MVWPSP.</p>
I07-5	<p>The comment notes a few benefits of the project, including jobs. Please note that Chapter 6, "Population, Employment, and Housing," and Section 20.3, "Growth-Inducing Impacts," of the Draft EIR evaluate the project-related impacts to population, employment, and housing, as well as growth inducement.</p>

The comment asserts that there is no benefit for wildlife or forests. In fact, the commitment to preserve the entire 6,376-acre East Parcel is a central component of the Specific Plan. The Specific Plan includes policies ensuring that, if the Specific Plan is approved, the entire East Parcel would be permanently preserved as open space (see page 3-11 of the Draft EIR). The East Parcel would provide a connection to other conserved lands, resulting in approximately 50,000 acres of contiguous open space. As stated on page 7-44 of the Draft EIR, several common vegetation and habitat types presently zoned for potential development would be conserved in perpetuity with implementation of the project.

- I07-6 The comment generally opposes the project and requests opposition to zoning changes. The comments are focused on the merits of the project rather than the adequacy of the Draft EIR analyses. Please see response to comment I07-1, above.
- I07-7 This comment incorporates information on LAFCOs and preservation of agricultural lands. Please see response to comment I07-1, above.

Shirlee Herrington

108

From: Hilary Davis <hilaryzuk@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 21, 2015 10:42 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Cc: Tahoe; Regional; Planning; "Agency <trpa">trpa.org
Subject: Comments on Martis Valley West Parcel Project DEIR

To: Placer County Community Development Resources Agency, Environmental Coordination Services

From: Hilary S. Davis, Tahoe City resident

Date: Dec. 21, 2015

Subject: Comments on the Martis Valley West Parcel Project DEIR

To Whom it May Concern,

The Martis Valley West Parcel Project ("MVWPP") Draft Environmental Impact Report ("DEIR") is insufficient because it does not address the cumulative impacts of the MVWPP and the development proposed on the adjacent neighboring parcel, the Brockway Campground Proposal ("BCP").

Background

Currently, there are two parcels being considered for development along Highway 267 near the summit of Brockway Pass. The MVWPP and the BCP are owned by the same landowner, Sierra Pacific Industries, and were originally considered as one big parcel for development by the project applicant, Crew Tahoe, LLC., and the project developer Mountainside Partners. When it was one large residential project, this project faced considerable community objection for its size and impact, especially since a portion of the project was within the official Tahoe Basin land use designation and subject to greater review.

As a result of community objections to the original development plan, the project applicant has now divided the project into two projects. The MVWPP includes 760 permitted residential parcels and 6.6 acres of commercial area that falls outside of the Tahoe Basin. The BCP proposes the development of 550 camp sites, a lodge and additional permanent structures within the Tahoe Basin.

The MVWPP DEIR, which is the subject of these comments, does not include an analysis of the cumulative impacts of development of the adjacent property as a large campground. Although the adjacent property is proposed for development by the same project applicant as the MVWPP, the combined impacts of these two developments are not sufficiently considered in the MVWPP DEIR.

The DEIR for the MVWPP Should Address Cumulative Impacts of the Proposed BCP

The DEIR for the MVWPP does not consider the cumulative impacts of the MVWPP and the proposed BCP. The BCP envisions 550 camp sites, which include a mixture of tent sites and RV

108-1

sites, each with its own gas fire pit. A lodge with a dining room, a swimming pool and other permanent structures, such as bathrooms, are also proposed. The BCP envisions the development of roads and parking pads for the camping sites, as well as public utilities including water, sewer and electric. The impact of the proposed BCP development and the MVWPP should be considered together, especially since they are adjoining properties owned by the same landowner and proposed for development by the same project applicant.

As it is, I could not find any mention of the proposed BCP in the MVWPP DEIR. Section 5.1.3 of the DEIR states:

"Surrounding Land Uses -

Southeast of the MVWPSP project site are undeveloped coniferous forest managed by the U.S. Forest Service Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit and located within the Tahoe Basin."

There is no mention of the proposed development of this adjacent property and it's potential impact. It seems unwise to approve of a very large residential development without assessing the potential impact of a proposed very large campground right next door. Although these two developments are proposed by the same landowner and developer, there is no discussion in the DEIR of cumulative traffic impacts, public safety, scenic impact, air quality and wildlife impacts. Common sense, CEQA and good planning requires that the full impacts of these projects be considered together.

Development along Highway 267 Should Include Development of a Bike Path

The combined development of the MVWPP and the BCP would greatly increase traffic along Highway 267 and over Brockway Pass. As an avid bicyclist, I have enjoyed and benefitted from the addition of bike lanes on the north and west shores of Lake Tahoe, as well as the wide shoulder and bike path along Highway 89 between Tahoe City and Truckee. Developing a bike lane on Highway 267 would complete a perfect loop with these other existing bike lanes. As it is now, biking along Highway 267 is very hazardous, and it would be more hazardous with the two proposed developments bringing potentially thousands more vehicles at any one time. A bike lane would provide safety for cyclists and drivers, and would also reduce car traffic in the summer.

A new DEIR should be prepared and recirculated to analyze the cumulative effects of development of the MVWPP and the BCP, especially with regard to traffic and public safety along Highway 267.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Hilary Davis

P.O. Box 724
Tahoe City, CA 96145

108-1
cont.

108-2

I08**Hilary Davis**
December 21, 2015

- I08-1 The comment describes the background of the project and the Brockway Campground proposal, and suggests that the Draft EIR does not address the cumulative impacts associated with the Brockway Campground. The Draft EIR considers the Brockway Campground proposal and other cumulative projects, as described in Section 4.2, “Cumulative Impact Analysis Methodology” and as shown on Table 4-2, “Cumulative Projects List,” on page 4-5 of the Draft EIR. Cumulative projects are considered throughout the impact analyses of Chapters 5 through 18; the analysis of cumulative impacts follows the project-specific analyses in each chapter. For further discussion regarding the Brockway Campground proposal, see Master Response 2 of this Final EIR.
- I08-2 The comment raises concerns regarding increased traffic on SR 267 due to the project and cumulative projects, such as the Brockway Campground. Chapter 10, “Transportation and Circulation,” of the Draft EIR evaluates traffic impacts related to the proposed MVWPSP as well as under cumulative conditions. In addition, see Master Response 6, regarding VMT.
- The comment also suggests that a bike path be implemented along SR 267. Existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the project area are described in Draft EIR Section 10.1.6. While numerous existing bicycle facilities are available in the region and many others are planned, a Class I or II bike path along SR 267 is not proposed as part of the MVWPSP. As described in the Draft EIR, there is a designated bike route on SR 267 from I-80 to Brockway Road, continuing with a Class I bike path to Schaffer Mill Road (see Draft EIR Exhibit 10-4). South of Schaffer Mill Road, SR 267 is considered an unsigned connecting paved route. Bike lanes exist through the Northstar Drive intersection, and five-foot-wide Class II bike lanes would be constructed on SR 267 at the project site access intersection to support safe passage through the new intersection.
- In addition, page 10-15 of the Draft EIR, under “Caltrans District 3 State Highways Bicycle Facility Plan,” states:
- For the segment of SR 267 from the Placer County/Nevada County line to Brockway Summit, the local jurisdiction (Placer County) recommends Class II bike lanes, while Caltrans recommends “Share the Road” designation. For the segment of SR 267 from Brockway Summit to SR 28, the local jurisdiction (Tahoe Regional Planning Agency) recommends Class II bike lanes, while Caltrans recommends a Class III bike route.
- The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter’s opinions regarding the merits or qualities of the proposed MVWPSP into consideration when making decisions regarding the project.
- The comment also asserts that the Draft EIR should be recirculated. Recirculation is not warranted. See Master Response 1.

Maywan Krach

109

From: John Demorest <johnlisad@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 23, 2015 6:34 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Development EIR

I will be brief:

After reading all the projected impacts of the EI report, I will summarize and say that, in my opinion, it is very obvious that the risks far outweigh any benefits of increasing the tax base and enriching the developers. Please protect Lake Tahoe and don't allow this project to go forward. Honestly, we don't have a housing crisis. I realize there is great financial pressure to allow this development, but hope you all will do the right thing for our community. Please don't junk up our beloved Tahoe.

109-1

Thanks,

John Demorest
resident of north LT for over 21 years

--

John Demorest
johnlisad@gmail.com

I09

John Demorest
October 23, 2015

I09-1

The comment expresses opposition to the MVWPSP project. The comment does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR. The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter's opinions regarding the merits or qualities of the proposed MVWPSP into consideration when making decisions regarding the project.

Shirlee Herrington

IO10

From: John Demorest <johnlisad@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 07, 2015 10:58 AM
To: Shirlee Herrington
Subject: Re: Martis Valley West Parcel (PGPA 20130080) - Public Review Period Extended to 12-22-15

Thanks for the corrected link. After reviewing the report, it is very clear to me that the impacts heavily outweigh the benefits of this proposed development. Honestly, it's time to say enough is enough. How far will overdevelopment of Tahoe be allowed before some responsible trustees realize that we should have stopped earlier. Why do we need this? Why indeed. Please put the brakes on before we are beyond the point of irreversible damage to our quality of life in Tahoe and destroy the reason so many of us choose to live here.

IO10-1

Thanks for your thoughtful consideration that this project isn't going to make Tahoe better.

John Demorest DDS (resident of Crystal Bay for over 20 years)

On Fri, Nov 6, 2015 at 2:56 PM, Shirlee Herrington <SHerring@placer.ca.gov> wrote:

Good Afternoon Mr. Demorest,

My apologies, our web design team completed website upgrades overnight that resulted in some changes to our links.

To view the DEIR, click this link below:

<http://www.placer.ca.gov/departments/communitydevelopment/envcoordsvcs/eir/martisvalleywestparcel/draft%20eir>

To view the Draft Specific Plan, use this link:

<http://www.placer.ca.gov/departments/communitydevelopment/planning/martisvalleywestparcelproject/martisvalleywestparceldraftsp>

Thank you for bringing this to my attention!

Thank you,

Shirlee

~~~~~

Shirlee I. Herrington  
Environmental Coordination Services  
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency  
3091 County Center Drive, Suite #190  
Auburn, CA 95603  
530-745-3132  
sherring@placer.ca.gov

~~~~~



From: John Demorest [mailto:johnlisad@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, November 06, 2015 2:43 PM
To: Shirlee Herrington
Subject: Re: Martis Valley West Parcel (PGPA 20130080) - Public Review Period Extended to 12-22-15

clicked on the link and Page Not Found message.

On Thu, Nov 5, 2015 at 1:13 PM, Shirlee Herrington <SHerring@placer.ca.gov> wrote:

To Interested Parties,

The Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Martis Valley West Specific Plan was released for public review on October 22, 2015. As noted in the Notice of Availability, the Draft EIR has a 45-day public review period, ending on December 7, 2015. Subsequent to the release of the Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR for the Martis Valley West Specific Plan, the County has received requests from the public to allow for an additional 15-day review of the environmental document. In these requests, it is noted that the expansive

information contained with environmental document warrants additional time to allow for the thorough review of the document.

Due to the public interest in this project, the County has concluded that, in the interest of allowing for robust public comment on this project, there is merit in allowing for additional time for the review of the document. Accordingly, Placer County hereby extends the Notice of Availability for the Draft EIR for the Martis Valley West Specific Plan for an additional 15 days. The public comment period for the Draft EIR for the Martis Valley West Specific Plan will now be from October 22, 2015 to December 22, 2015. Attached, please see the revised Notice of Availability for your reference.

The Draft EIR prepared for the project is available on the County's website for public review. Here is a link to access the document:

<http://www.placer.ca.gov/departments/communitydevelopment/envcoordsvcs/eir/martisvalleywestparcel/deir>

A public hearing on the Draft EIR is scheduled on November 19, 2015, at 10:05 a.m., at the North Tahoe Conference Center (8318 North Lake Boulevard, Kings Beach, CA 96143). The purpose of the hearing is to receive comments on the Draft EIR for the project. Your comments can also be emailed to cdraecs@placer.ca.gov or mailed to the contact information below.

Information on the Specific Plan can be found at this link:
<http://www.placer.ca.gov/departments/communitydevelopment/planning/martisvalleywestparcelproject/publicdraftspecificplan>

Thank you,

Shirlee

~~~~~

Shirlee I. Herrington

Environmental Coordination Services

Placer County Community Development Resource Agency

3091 County Center Drive, Suite #190

Auburn, CA 95603

530-745-3132

sherring@placer.ca.gov



---

**I010**

---

**John Demorest**  
**November 7, 2015**

---

**I010-1**

The comment expresses opposition to the MVWPSP project. The comment does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the Draft EIR. The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter's opinions regarding the merits or qualities of the proposed MVWPSP into consideration when making decisions regarding the project.